

**Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Plan**  
**Technical Advisory Committee – Project Identification Subcommittee**

<b>Subject</b>	Project Identification Subcommittee Meeting #4 Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Planning Framework	<b>Date</b>	June 7, 2021
<b>Facilitator</b>	Lewis L. Lawrence	<b>Time</b>	3:00 pm – 4:30 pm
<b>Location</b>	WebEx - <a href="https://governor.virginia.gov/i/r1yrt">https://governor.virginia.gov/i/r1yrt</a>	<b>Scribe</b>	Emily Sokol

<b>Invitees/Attendees</b>			
<b>#</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization/Role</b>	<b>Attended?</b>
<b>Project Identification Subcommittee Members and Staff Advisors</b>			
1.	Lewis L. Lawrence – Co-Chair	Executive Director, Middle Peninsula Planning District Commission	Y
2.	Carol Considine – Vice Chair	Program Head, Flooding and the Built Environment, Institute for Coastal Adaptation and Resilience at Old Dominion University	Y
3.	Shep Moon - Staff	Coastal Planner, Virginia Coastal Zone Management Programs	Y
4.	Jill Bieri	Director of Virginia Coast Reserve, The Nature Conservancy	Y
5.	Alec Brebner	Executive Director, Crater Planning District Commission	Y
6.	Clyde Cristman	Director, Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation	
7.	Shawn Crumlish	Director of Financial Services, Virginia Resources Authority	Y
8.	Martha Heeter	Executive Director, Plan RVA (Richmond Regional Planning District Commission)	
9.	Traci Munyan	Program Administrative Manager, Dept. of Housing and Community Development	Y
10.	Normand Goulet	Director, Division of Environmental and Resiliency Planning, Northern Virginia Regional Commission	Y
11.	Dr. Mark Luckenbach	Associate Dean for Research and Advisory Services, Virginia Institute of Marine Science at William & Mary	
12.	Georgie Márquez	Principle, Andre Márquez Architects	Y
13.	Carlos Rivero	Chief Data Officer, CDO	
<b>Scheduled Speakers</b>			
14.	Brian Batten	Dewberry	Y
15.	Alaurah Moss	Dewberry	Y
16.	Dan Medina	Dewberry	Y
17.	John Paine		Y
<b>Designated Alternates</b>			
18.	Curt Smith – Co-Chair	Deputy Director, Middle Peninsula Planning District Commission	Y
19.	Russ Baxter	Deputy Director, Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation	Y
20.	Sarah Stewart	Planning Manager, Plan RVA	
21.	Jay Ruffa	Crater PDC	Y
<b>Other Participants</b>			
22.	Ann Phillips	Rear Admiral, US Navy (Ret.) – Office of the Governor	Y
23.	Connor Winstead	VA Dept. of Conservation & Recreation	Y
24.	Matt Dalon	VA Dept. of Conservation & Recreation	Y
25.	Nick Meade		Y
26.	Toni Utterback		Y
27.	Whitney Katchmark		Y
28.	Michelle Rioux		Y
29.	Emily Steinhilber		Y

**Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Plan**  
**Technical Advisory Committee – Project Identification Subcommittee**

<b>Invitees/Attendees</b>			
#	Name	Organization/Role	Attended?
30.	Margaret Rockwell		Y
31.	Keith Cannady		Y
32.	Carl Hershner		Y
33.	Shurui Zhang		Y
34.	Denise Nelson		Y
35.	Cisre Gonzalez		Y
36.	Kevin Du Bois		Y
37.	Rob Young		Y
38.	Kimberly Cain		Y
39.	Cindy DiFranco		Y
40.	Kristin Owen		Y
41.	Ben Nettleton		Y
<b>Consultant Support</b>			
42.	Emily Sokol	Vision Planning and Consulting	Y
43.	Dale Morris	The Water Institute of the Gulf	Y

<b>Agenda/Minutes</b>		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
1.	Welcome/FOIA Preamble/Roll Call	<p>Lewis Lawrence welcomed all attendees to the meeting and introduced Subcommittee Members, those serving as designated alternates, Subcommittee Advisors, and guest speakers.</p> <p>Lewis then called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm and read the Section 1289 required language. Lewis asked Shep Moon to take roll, and Shep advised that a quorum was present.</p> <p>Lewis advised that only panelists will be unmuted for discussion and public participants can ask questions through the chat and will be called upon at the end of the meeting, during the public comment period. If there are connectivity issues or a disruption occurs, please contact staff at 804-698-4297.</p> <p>Lewis asked for a motion to proceed with the meeting virtually. Shawn Crumlish motioned, and Normand Goulet seconded. The motion passed unanimously.</p>
2.	Chair Updates	Lewis advised the Subcommittee that their comments to CRMP 3.2.2 had been submitted to Dewberry for review. There was no other Old Business to address during this meeting.
3.	Dewberry Presentation on Project Database Schema – Brian Batten, Dan Medina, Alaurah Moss, and John Paine	<p>Lewis turned the floor over to the Dewberry team to present a summary of the work they have conducted and their thoughts about how to move forward. In doing so, they discussed the existing project database gap analysis they conducted to review existing databases against the initial CRMP database schema and identify what information is available to populate CRMP fields and what information is still needed. After reviewing the data fields, they provided an outline of the project classification schema and described the need for a data call to collect accurate project information. (See Attached Slides)</p> <p>Rear Admiral Ann Phillips added that Secretary Strickler would be reaching out to the Planning District Directors to let them know about the need for a data call and provide them a heads-up that this request would be coming in the near future. She emphasized that they do not want to place all of the burden on the localities and recognized that, with</p>

**Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Plan**  
**Technical Advisory Committee – Project Identification Subcommittee**

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		<p>outreach efforts and design charrettes coming in the late summer, more work will be required at the local level. The State wants to ensure that it is reaching out early in the process to acquire the appropriate contacts from the PDCs who can best help with collecting accurate project information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lewis: I believe that is a necessary step to take because, for example, the projects in the Wetlands Watch database have not even been vetted by the PDCs. We do not want to jump to the PDCs when they might not even be aware of these projects or of what is coming in the future.</li> <li>- Rear Admiral Phillips: Yes, we definitely do not want to put the cart before the horse in this situation.</li> <li>- Russ Baxter: Where did the projects in the Wetlands Watch database come from?</li> <li>- Lewis: We do not know- I can only speculate. Wetlands Watch did a great job hunting for projects, but I know of multiple PDCs that were not contacted, and yet there are projects in the database in those PDCs.</li> <li>- Russ Baxter: When was this information collected- over what time period?</li> <li>- Lewis: I have no idea.</li> <li>- Norm: I have talked to staff and local government, and they have no idea where this information came from. Though helpful, it is a real wildcard.</li> <li>- Lewis: It is likely that they data mined whatever information was publicly available to inform the database.</li> <li>- Rear Admiral Phillips: Yes, exactly. Some of the projects were meant to bolster the identification of need but were not necessarily approved by local governments or planning districts. There has been no screening of the projects, mostly data mining.</li> </ul> <p>Brian Batten described potential approaches that had been discussed with the State regarding the data call. There was discussion about whether to start with a fresh data call or to recycle some of the information. They decided starting fresh would likely be better to allow contributors to better explain their available data. Brian described two ideas for facilitating the data call: a spreadsheet and an online form. He stressed that they wanted to make it as easy as possible for localities, PDCs, and contributors to provide information. Since, with some of the databases, there is a question of how the data is interpreted or where it came from, they would be more comfortable hearing directly from the owners. Brian then opened the floor to the Subcommittee for feedback and discussion.</p>
4.	Feedback for Dewberry on Project ID Data Call	<p>Discussion Point- Lewis: What you have laid out is an impressive and complex schema to collect a lot of information about these projects, but it also requires a time investment from the localities. Why would localities want to dedicate the time to provide this information- what is the incentive? It might be difficult to get this buy-in without an appropriate incentive.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Rear Admiral Phillips: The major incentive is that they will be a part of this larger CRMP project. Also, participating may provide them greater awareness of funding and grant opportunities. There will be an advantage to having a state plan that we can point to, that federal grant programs might identify projects associated with this plan as a priority. States with an established plan and process, that understand both the short- and long-term risks of coastal flooding are going to be in a better position to gain federal dollars. Also, it will help our state prepare for</li> </ul>

**Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Plan**  
**Technical Advisory Committee – Project Identification Subcommittee**

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		<p>future disasters. We have been relatively fortunate in the past. If we have prioritized process in the case of a major disaster, we will be better prepared to allocate funding and resources in a way that is effective. We are committing to this project proactively, rather than waiting for retroactive prompting by a natural disaster, which provides us with opportunities for better preparedness. We are planning for the future in a way that prepares the Commonwealth by unifying the goals of localities and the State.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Jill Bieri: This is ground zero for community outreach. We need to make it clear why these localities want to participate. They need to be at the table from the very beginning, so we need to be very clear about what the benefit is to them.</li> </ul> <p>Kevin Du Bois (in chat): As part of the general data you collect, would you also want to identify projects located in an underserved community to be able to quantify how much resources are dedicated there?</p> <p>Kevin (in chat): Are DoD Joint Land Use Study climate resilience projects represented in the project databases you referenced? How could DoD validate that?</p> <p>Carol Considine (in chat): I asked HRPDC this question today and they stated that DoD JLUS climate resilience projects are not represented in the HRPDC Resilience Projects database.</p> <p>Discussion Point- Lewis: Should the localities be thinking about this as a static database, or will this be a dynamic project database where anyone at any point in time can add projects? Will projects have to be identified by a certain date? I have seen with some programs in the past that many localities are skeptical about participating, but once they see other localities benefitting from the process, they then want to get involved. And then they are often frustrated when the program does not allow for participation later in the process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Brian: That is an important question. At some point in this iteration, we do have to cut off entry into the database, so that we can move forward. However, I think the long-term goal is to have a more dynamic, living database that is accessible via the web, into which anyone can enter projects. There would be a gatekeeper to screen the information, of course, and new projects would be entered into the evaluation process for the next iteration. Rear Admiral Phillips can speak more to the State's vision for this database.</li> <li>- Dale Morris (in chat): The success of Louisiana and Texas in supplemental federal appropriations (post disaster) is directly related to their planning and prioritization that can communicate effectively and timely to congressional appropriators in the post-disaster spending spasm.</li> <li>- Kevin (in chat): Are the project owners the localities then? Again, how does the DoD validate to make sure that these projects are not missed?</li> <li>- Carol (in chat): Yes, project owners are the localities and DoD will have to reach out to them to ensure they are entered in the database.</li> <li>- Rear Admiral Phillips: The intent is that this will continue to develop as a living database after the first iteration. We want this database to be accessible and updated as the planning process continues over time. To Kevin's question of how DoD validates so that the projects are not missed, they, or whoever the owner is, would be able to ensure that the project is included, as the database would be</li> </ul>

**Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Plan**  
**Technical Advisory Committee – Project Identification Subcommittee**

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		<p>open to the public. To your other question, project owners are anyone who has the capacity to implement a project. In most cases, that is a locality, but it may be different under other circumstances, such as a tribal authority.</p> <p>Discussion Point- Kristin Owen: I am from the Project Evaluation Subcommittee, and I think it is important that, in conducting this data call to PDCs, you identify who in the localities the PDCs should be reaching out to. It is important to be clear what the incentive is, but it is just as important that this information is being disseminated to as many people possible on staff. Also, all the PDCs have a hazard mitigation contact list that could be good to contact.</p> <p>Discussion Point- Carl Hershner: From our review and discussions during the Project Evaluation Subcommittee, it seems that the development of the schema reflects many of our comments. One remaining challenge is enabling the evaluating body, whether that is the TAC or the State, to have a sense of how these projects fit into the broader of picture of need throughout the State. There will likely need to be a separate data call to the PDCs in the future that asks for how the projects address the needs of vulnerable communities, or how does the project identify the basis of need. We must think about how we can best approach the next iteration to prioritize needs and seek this kind of information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lewis: Yes, the determination of whose need is being addressed by a project is critical. Identifying the scale and scope of need and prioritizing different needs will be a big undertaking for this project.</li> <li>- Normand: Concerning the project classification schema, I think we will need to have an “Other” category under project subtypes. The subtypes listed here are very prescriptive so far, and localities may have projects that do not fit into these types.</li> </ul> <p>Discussion Point- Traci Munyan: I have a question about the classification schema and data fields. Why is the project owner considered optional at this point? Having that information would give us more information about the type of population being addressed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Brian: I believe that that is a required field.</li> <li>- Alaurah Moss: It is only the project owner classification that is optional, but we could move that field to be required. We were trying to limit the amount of required information to reduce the amount of work for our contributors, but we can change that if you all believe it would be more helpful.</li> <li>- Lewis: I think the project owner classification is important. It becomes even more important when discussing money and if the projects are being funded partly by a unit of government. Currently, there is not a lot of money for resiliency that is going from private entities directly to private citizens, at least in Virginia.</li> </ul> <p>Discussion Point- Georgie Márquez: I may be misunderstanding about the scope of the projects being identified in this project. It seems as though we are excluding many types of projects, especially in the remediation field. This leaves out a lot of existing project structures. However, I may be looking at it too much from an economic development perspective.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Alaurah: We originally had such projects as floodproofing and building elevation under the classification of community infrastructure, but we removed it because we do not feel the scope of the CRMP covers individual property. So, that might be an oversight.</li> </ul>

**Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Plan**  
**Technical Advisory Committee – Project Identification Subcommittee**

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lewis: I think everyone here has a different definition of what individual property is, so can we dive more into that?</li> <li>- Kristin: I understand that the project is really pushing coastal retreat, but I do not think this is realistic for some areas, as they are often not able to elevate or floodproof a whole block of structures. It often is accomplished more piece meal over time. There needs to be more nuance in the description of these project types. I agree with Georgie that it is relevant to our local economies to include one-off structural changes, especially if it is included as a component of a community's larger plan.</li> <li>- Dan Medina: Projects that can have more influence than changing a single structure, such as elevating a larger scope of buildings, is going to get a higher evaluation score. If there is just one or a couple of structures that needs to be addressed by a project, it is unlikely that it will pass through the prioritization process or score high enough. There may be components of a project that have more individual focuses, but we are looking for projects that will have a larger impact.</li> <li>- Kristin: In the pre-decisional document, this infrastructure retrofitted upgrade is only allowed for critical structures. I just think it should also include non-critical structures.</li> <li>- Alaurah: It could be brought in under other programs and policies.</li> <li>- Brian: Yes, we should broaden that. As we were defining these categories, we shifted different programs between different programs. We should clarify that a program could come in and conduct retrofitting or elevation on a larger scale.</li> </ul> <p>Discussion Point- Lewis: Many of these areas and properties on the waterfront are privately owned. We have communities on the waterfront that need mitigation help, but they are privately owned. If their projects do not qualify or are not of interest to the CRMP, we need to be very transparent and let them know that their needs will not be addressed in this process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Carol Considine: Yes, we do not want to misguide individuals. For projects that are being proposed by an individual property, it would be beneficial if local PDCs could bundle these projects or in some way sponsor them in a way that would allow them to participate.</li> <li>- Dan and Brian: We completely agree. One thing we should focus on is finding a way to incentivize localities to bundle these projects.</li> <li>- Rear Admiral Phillips: That is one of the goals of the CRMP- to incentivize regional collaboration.</li> <li>- Lewis: Can we expand more on the idea of regional collaboration? Do we want multi-jurisdictional projects or have bundles of projects within one jurisdiction that are not contiguous segments of land? Conducting a multi-jurisdictional project would be very difficult.</li> <li>- Kristin: I agree. Realistically it makes sense to focus more on community-level projects rather than region-level projects. Policies and processes can be very different between localities, making collaboration extremely difficult on these types of projects.</li> </ul> <p>Discussion Point- Carol: I believe something else that needs to be made clear is that, after the first round of project evaluation for the first iteration, when will the next round of evaluation occur and can projects be reevaluated?</p>

**Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Plan**  
**Technical Advisory Committee – Project Identification Subcommittee**

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Brian: I do not think we have an answer to that yet. That depends on the frequency at which the project is maintained.</li> <li>- Matt Dalon: Yes, this has not been fully fleshed out yet.</li> <li>- Rear Admiral Phillips: Going forward, this is a question that we can keep in mind and seek to answer- When is the next evaluation period and how often do we update.</li> <li>- Dan: This is also often determined by the availability of funding sources.</li> </ul> <p>Discussion Point- Lewis: I would like to get some more clarification about the types of projects we are looking to identify and support. Is the purpose of the CRMP to produce a study that shows where there is need and vulnerability? Or is the purpose for the Commonwealth to prioritize what is considered most important to the State? Water does not discriminate- it will go where it wants to go and destroy what it wants to destroy. What is the basis for determining need?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Dale: As I mentioned in the chat, in Louisiana, prioritization outcomes are incorporated into the State’s evaluation of what the legislature will allocate money to. They identify how much money is available and use their plan to help prioritize where their money will go that year or in the subsequent years.</li> </ul> <p>Discussion Point- Kristin: I have a comment on nature-based approaches. For communities captured by the CRMP that are not tidal, the project types seem limited and coastal-focused. If this plan will cover those communities in their entirety, we should include projects that make sense for them, such as expanding language like “wetland restoration” to include, for example, stream restoration. We should also include green infrastructure projects that are used to address problems of urban flooding. I just want to make sure that those communities are not left out, and that we do not forget about capacity building projects. Some of this could be addressed by expanding some of the definitions you have listed, such as expanding “coastal shoreline” to include riverine shorelines. There needs to be extra project types added that apply to non-coastal communities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Normand: I agree. There needs to be a significant expansion to the list.</li> </ul> <p>Discussion Point- Whitney Katchmark: For identifying location and project extent, are you planning to request points or polygons? We have tried to use polygons in the past and have experienced some trouble, so that is a consideration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Brian: We would love to receive polygons, but we realize that can be a difficult process. At a minimum, we would like to receive latitude and longitude. We are discussing different options for the future and thinking about how to leverage some of these touchpoints with the localities to work on this.</li> <li>- Alaurah: The idea is to request a polygon footprint only for the nature-based projects, as well as others for which this might be necessary. For community capacity building projects, we can assume that the project would benefit the entire community, so they will just provide that information.</li> <li>- Brian: We looked at how to import data from existing databases, which is how they performed the gap analysis.</li> <li>- John: One idea Alaurah had was phasing and prioritizing projects, not requiring this process for those that it is not necessary.</li> </ul>

**Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Plan**  
**Technical Advisory Committee – Project Identification Subcommittee**

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		<p>Discussion Point- Lewis: Could you provide us a better understanding of what is considered to get a low project evaluation rating? VMRC is focused on promoting living shoreline projects, and they do not even require a GIS shapefile. You are asking for extra layering than what is even required by VMRC. Is there a connection back to the VMRC project database? Because those are shovel-ready projects that are piling up, waiting for permits. There are two different realities that exist between these shovel-ready projects and the more abstract projects for future implementation. What is our focus?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Dan: We are not aware of the needs from the perspective of the permitting agency, as well as the analyses they conduct. The polygon footprint serves our purpose. If projects show up at the permitting window, they are already in the development stage. So, we are focusing on projects that are happening in the future or are in pre-development. For projects under construction, we assume that they will happen, so we are not ranking those.</li> <li>- Rear Admiral Phillips: You are talking about projects under construction. Shovel-ready projects are highly important for our purposes. We should get Ben Nettleton's perspective to provide an idea of the projects seen by VMRC currently, as they relate to this process.</li> <li>- Matt: There are going to be many gaps in the first iteration that will be identified as we move forward, as well as additional areas of need that will be found. One goal is to identify projects that can address these needs.</li> </ul> <p>Discussion Point: Kevin (in chat): Where would projects that abate future climate impacts, like regenerative farming practices, fall within the project categories?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Russ (in chat): To Kevin, they probably need to interact with DCR's Agriculture BMP program, Soil and Water Conservation Districts, USDA-NRCS, and others. This is an area that is getting more and more attention in these arenas. Also, the Dept. of Forestry and other partners are wading into this space.</li> <li>- Dan: The issue with regenerative farming practices and climate-abating programs in addressing flooding issues is that it is difficult to make this connection quantitatively. We all know that there is a connection but demonstrating that in a way that reflects a greater priority over other projects is going to be a challenge. We do not want to leave these projects out altogether- maybe they could be included as capacity building projects. These projects are attracting more interest, but this might not be the arena for them.</li> </ul> <p>Lewis: Well, we have continued to make things more complicated, but this is an important conversation and will make the plan better moving forward. Brian, what would you like us, as a Subcommittee, to do next?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Brian: Once we have discussed your contributions and dissected this conversation, as well as gone through the comments you have sent us, we will reach out to request more directed feedback. We appreciate all of your perspectives and the concerns you have raised today.</li> </ul>
5.	Public Comment Period	No one registered for public comments, and no public comments were posed in the chat.
6.	Next Meeting Date	Lewis advised the Subcommittee that the next meeting will be on June 22 <sup>nd</sup> , 10 am – 12 pm.

**Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Plan  
 Technical Advisory Committee – Project Identification Subcommittee**

<b>Agenda/Minutes</b>		
<b>#</b>	<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Minutes</b>
		Russ Baxter asked staff to verify that he has been added to the Subcommittee’s distribution list as the alternate for Clyde Cristman from DCR, as he had not been receiving all the notifications. Emily Sokol verified that he has been added to the contact list.
7.	Wrap-Up and Adjourn	Lewis asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Russ motioned, and Normand seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 4:37 pm.

<b>Action Items</b>			
<b>#</b>	<b>Action Item</b>	<b>Owner (Organization)</b>	<b>Due Date</b>
1.			

If you have any questions, please contact Emily Sokol, Vision Planning and Consulting, at [esokol@vision-pc.net](mailto:esokol@vision-pc.net).